

**Remarks**

Claim 16 is amended. Claim 17 is cancelled. Claims 16 and 18-27 are pending and are presented for examination.

The Office Action requested an update in the specification regarding related cases and asked that Applicant to inform the examiner how the CIP application differs from the parent application.

Applicant has now amended the specification to update the related cases from which priority is claimed. Additionally, the present CIP application includes disclosure not literally found in the parent application. For example, additional material in the Summary of the Invention section can be found beginning on page 5, line 17 and continuing to page 7, line 20. Figures 5-10 in the present application are not found in the parent application from which priority is claimed. The section entitled "Detailed Description of the Invention" includes an additional description of embodiments that begins on page 17, line 5 and continues though page 23, line 24. Finally, Example 6 (page 42) though Example 10 (page 54) in the present application were not in the parent application from which priority is claimed.

Claim 16-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as indefinite due to the use of term "capable of" in claim 16, paragraph (d). Claim 17 was rejected for failing to further limit claim 16 from which it depends. Claim 17 has been cancelled, and claim 16 has been amended. It is believed that amended claim 16 renders the rejection as moot.

Applicant acknowledges the art made of record in the Office Action but not relied upon.

With this paper, Applicant has endeavored to address all of the issues raised in the recent Office Action. It is believed that the application is now in condition for allowance which is now respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Feb. 25, 2004

Date

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
3M Innovative Properties Company  
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833

By: Daniel R. Pastirik

Daniel R. Pastirik, Reg. No.: 33,025  
Telephone No.: (651) 737-2685